



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Goethe's novel on the romantic drama from this standpoint. He makes, however, the gravely exaggerated statement (p. 98) that "there is scarcely a page in the novel on which the word 'Schicksal' does not occur". After discussing the varying attitude toward "Fate" in Germany from 1770 to 1796, he comes to the harmless conclusion (p. 115) that Fate is "everything that stands over man and plays with him, whether it brings happiness or sorrow, whether it strikes the guilty or the innocent." He thus strips the term of its traditional meaning and makes it about equivalent to "motivation". And with this interpretation he analyzes the "Schicksalsdramen" from "Karl von Berneck" (1795) to "Fortunat" (1816). These dates are chosen because up to 1795 Tieck had ridiculed the idea of Fate, from then on he poetized it until in "Fortunat" he satirized it. "Die Braut von Messina" (1803) is not therefore considered the first Fate-tragedy, nor is "Der 24ste Februar" regarded as in any way dependent upon it. It is simply one in a series, differing from the others only in technique. In this way Wendriner has calmly overthrown the prevailing opinion and argued from a theory of his own making. And yet the book is valuable as a compilation and suggestive as a study.

In Jacobowski's "Anthologie rom. Lyrik" (Leipzig, 1900), there are a number of beautiful vignettes, a fine frontispiece and one lyric (Es blüht eine schöne Blume, pp. 148-149) by Philip Otto Runge, the Novalis of rom. painting with the "Dichtergeist in einem Malerauge." The lyric centres around "ein edles Blümelein" in a far off land. It is fragrant with the spirit of Böhme, Tieck, Novalis and Heine. Intimate with the Berlin-Jena school, admired by Goethe, stimulated by Schelling, and owing the same sort of fundamental debt to Tieck that Oehlenschläger owed to Steffens, Runge was a romanticist of the truest type. Yet Haym does not mention his name. Aubert has therefore rendered a grateful service. The work is based on Runge's *Hinterl. Schriften* (ed. by the artist's brother, Daniel, Hamb., 1840-1841). It contains precious few facts concerning Runge's life, nor does it show just wherein Runge's romanticism lay. But these facts can be secured from prosaic books, and

Runge's romanticism will spring into the eyes of all but the purblind. It is not a scientific treatise. It has no beginning, no middle, no end. The only mark of division is the paragraph. But it is an attractive book. The main interest centres around the discussion of Runge's *magnum opus*, "Die Tageszeiten," to which he considered everything else a preliminary study. The treatment of this one work throws radiant light on rom. nature-sense and art endeavour. There are 31 superb illustrations by Runge and one by his teacher, Jens Juel. Aubert has here written one of that long series of individual studies that will include Baader, Bernhardi, the Boissereés, Carus, Eschenmeyer, Loeben, Mesmer, Adam Müller, Passavant, Ringseis, Ritter, Reichardt, G. H. Schubert, Savigny, Solger, A. G. Werner, and others. And then, after all these studies have been written, the *general* history of German romanticism will have to be rewritten.

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College, Columbia University.

Les deux Poèmes de la Folie Tristan, publiés par JOSEPH BÉDIER. Paris: Firmin-Didot, Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1907. 8vo, vii, 129 pp.

Professor Bédier, in publishing the three volumes of his study of the legend regarding Tristan,¹ has presented, in convenient form, the Oxford and Berne versions of the episode "Tristan as fool." The Berne version had already been published by Professor Morf,² and the Oxford version by Francisque Michel.³ The latter work is now difficult to procure. In neither of the publications mentioned was a study of the language made. Professor Bédier has reproduced Morf's text with slight alterations. The reader is referred to Morf's article for a comparison of the two texts.

¹ *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, poème du xiii^e siècle*. Paris, SATF., 1902-1907. 2 vols., and the volume the title of which appears at the head of this review.

² *Romania*, xv, 1885, 558-574.

³ *Tristan. Recueil de ce qui reste des Poèmes relatifs à ses Aventures*. Londres, Pickering, 1835. 3 vols.

This review deals exclusively with the Oxford version, an edition⁴ of which the reviewer had announced in 1903. The reviewer has before him a rotographic reproduction of the manuscript: Bodleian, Douce d. 6. The two versions are now available, but, in the case of the Oxford version, a number of errors have appeared, in part due to incorrect transcription of the manuscript. Changes are made, in several instances, without any indication of the manuscript forms, and there is frequently failure to note the manuscript forms differing from those set down in the text as printed, and, also, incorrect forms are ascribed to the manuscript. The poem is corrected to eight syllables. Do we want this? It is well known that the verse-count in Anglo-Norman poems is irregular in a large number of instances. To the French ear these irregularities seem harsh and unbalanced, but we are not concerned here with a continental text. On the other hand, the substitution of *k'* and *ke* for *ki*, nominative, 11, 37, 189, etc., will seem just as strange to the eye. However, the system of Anglo-Norman versification is still an unsettled problem, altho various conjectures have been made regarding it.

Pg. ii, note 4, correct to "t. xxxv, 1906."

The Introduction: P. 6, par. 18: *girfaus*: *vau*s, 507, are *girfaus*: *vau*s in the ms. P. 8: *grant* 103, 303, are fem., and not masc. P. 9: *chasciez*, 756, is *chasse* in the ms., which is given in the text by B.; *sauve*: *accorde*, 815, are *sauvez*: *accordez* in the manuscript, given correctly in the text. P. 10, par. 1: *k'*, 11 (see variant in text), 37, 925, 982, are ms. *ki*. P. 11, par. 3: *lors* does not occur in the ms.; *lores* is the only form present.

Manuscript forms not acknowledged are: 4, 29 *kar*, 31 *pensout*, 37 *hom*, 56 *pelise*, 82 *volum*, 86 *ft'*, 98 *rais*, 115 *gurvirmout*, (In no case is the letter *s* made like the initial letter of this word, while *g* is regularly so made), 116 *cornwaleis*, 126 *quereient*, 133 *droit*, 136 *ki*, 147 *lu dit*, 156 *supirer*, 159 *k*, *il ni prat*, 160 *k*, *il pot truver*, 161

valer, 162 *saver*, 168 *me*, 179 *ore*, 187, *bricū*, 188 *maisum*, 192 *de un*, 198 *averas*, 212 *T.*, *ben*, 241 *me*, *so*, 243 *respūdu*, 252 *cūilent*, 265 *lui*, 277 *alettat*, 279 *ele*, 297 *raïne*, 319 *Isolt*, 339 *serst*, *n'rcir*, 363 *menbrer*, 371 *ore*, 385 *nesst*, 409 *ore*, 420 *lange*, 481 *le ad*, 493 *levres*, 652 *la baivre*, 666 *for*, *tuz*, 683 *fere*, 698 *ne ne me*, 702 *ki*, *ūblie*, 715 *ne vus m̄bre*, 734 *amans*, 743 *kar*, 755 *amūte*, 776 *je*, 823 *enbrune*, 824 *dune*, 825 *chair*, 828 *voz*, 844 *ke*, 875 *osteur*, 884 *gañt*, or *gaūt*, 897 *fet*, 914 *mustrat*, 925 *ki*, 932 *afaitat*, 948 *occire*, 964 *fin*, 973 *ore*.

Errors in acknowledging manuscript forms occur in: 27 *so*, 270 *aves*, 283 *cele*, 386 *alus*, 398 *Morholt*, 433 *le aviez*, 482 *le ad*, 563 *cist* (in variant 564, read 563), 900 *veret*.

General: *car* 4, 29, 743, is not found in the ms.; the regular form here, as elsewhere, is *kar*; B. substitutes *c* for *s*; ms. *so* 27, 241, *si* 270, *sa* 588, but *so* is left 52, 56, 128, 140, 163, 246. The break between 34 and 35 is not necessary for the sense. 86 *ie*, for ms. *e* in *fiert*; ms. *ft'*, which is not acknowledged. *Ie* occurs only in *tient*: *vient* 189–190. *O* for ms. *u*: *hom* 137, *trover* 160, *respondu* 243, *trovat* 752, 754; the ms., however, uses both *o* and *u* interchangeably elsewhere. See vocabulary. 147 B. *li*, ms. *lu*. For *lu* elsewhere compare the vocabulary. *Li* is also written for *lui* 265. For *lui* elsewhere, see the vocabulary. *-eir* for ms. *-er*: *valer*: *saver* (not acknowledged) 161–162. *-er* is also the ms. form in *aver* 298, 332, 642, 918. 164 *heeit* for ms. *het*. The text does not require the change of tense. If B. had written *sure*, as in 915, he would have emended according to his method. 277 ms. *alettat* is *aleitat* in the text, and *alettat* in the vocabulary. 283 *Ge la* is clearly *Cele* in the ms. *Ge* does not occur in the ms. nor in B.'s vocabulary. 468 B. has *quai*, also 558, 615, 683, 824, but 551 *quei*. The ms. in all cases abbreviates *q^u-i*, which rimes with *tei* 615. 481 *a* for ms. *ad*, and 938 *a* is inserted. Why not *at* as in 152, 524, 937, or *ad* as in 83, 128, etc., twenty-five times. The form *a*, as verb, does not occur in the ms. B.'s note regarding *malarz*, 498, is not convincing. An examination of the manuscript renders his statement, "*qui peut assez bien se justifier paléographique-ment*," incomprehensible. The form *mainz* is

⁴*La Folie Tristan. An Anglo-Norman Poem*, edited by Albert Eugene Curdy. Part I, a Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore, John Murphy Co., 1903. (See Preface); and *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie*, VII, 1902, i, 197.

very distinct in the manuscript. The ms. should be corrected to *mainz preng e plunguns e butors*. 628 *vus mist*: read *vus oi*, place the interrogation point after *volt*, 630, and a period after *main*, 633, and doubt regarding the construction disappears. 683 *faire*; ms. *fere*, the only occurrence in the ms. of this form. *Faire* is the general spelling in the ms., ten times, B. substitutes *fere* for *fare* 812.

Vocabulary: *Aparceut*⁵ 795, *assembler* 737, *aie*, subj., 616, *ait* 518, *eu* 762, *cert* 17, *chault* 646, *chaut pas* 204, *cremout* 101, *criai* 450, *cui-**dent* 252, *cultel* 525, *cumande* 628, better *sauve-**garde*, *protection*: *de*, *jour*, 694, *dis*, 8, plur. *desus* 549, not 559, *desguiser* 41, *dait* 777, *devint* 920, *dist* 573, 641, *dreiture* 792, not 762, *dunt*, pron., 704, 899, *entant* 295, *entrat* 260, not 207, *enviat* 393, not 207, *estes*, *voici venir*, 256, *estre*, remove 12, insert 8, 423, *es* 322, 369, *fustes* 470, *fet* 595, (ms. *fet* is changed to B. *fait* 897), *faus* 563, in text *fous*, *grue* 493, not 498, *gacte* (*guaitier*) 256, *issez* 378, *ivern* 139, *junes* 718, *kac* 514, *keue* 512, *laissai* 829, *lerat* 992 should be under *laier*, *de loing* 883, is text *loins*, *meis* 968, not 970, *de grant manere* 207, 682, not 202, 632, *mist* 628, not 638, and 885, *Morholt* 398, not *Morhol*, and remove the ?, *mes*, plur. of *mun*, 493, 505, *nus* 876, meaning ?, *oi* 3, pf., *oir* 922, *paisant* 135, *pardonat* 893, *parsiure*, remove 669, *pleing* 854, *prenge* 138, not *pregne*, *quanque* 66, *quid* 597, *rendre* and *repondre*, out of position; *riant* 389, not 319, *sailer* 747, *soi*, pf. *saveir*, 799, *sei*, refl. pron., 529, *suliez* 942, *ta*, place under *tun* with other occurrences of the form, *tanlant* 256, *te* 296, 370, *tent* 990, *teneit* 716, *tracier*, remove 721, *Trantris*, remove 338, *tresque* 771, *uel* 718, *unc* 916, not 600, *unkes* 911, *unke* 63, *vine* 418, not 148 and 773, *vergunder*, out of position, *vest* 200, *vestu* 645, *vestue* 191, *voler*, out of position, *vostre*, remove 562, *Isolt* 319, 367.

A. E. CURDY.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ORLANDO ORLANDINI: *Le to belesse*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—It may be of interest to add to a recent note on Orlandini (Nando), in *Modern Language Notes* (vol. xxv, no. 5), a mention of a new volume by him: *Le to belesse* (Tipografia legatoria T. Livio, Venezia, 1910), dedicated *A una che no gh'è più*. The various chapter headings *Massa bela*, *Le segie*, *I cavei*, *I oci*, *El naseto*, *I denti*, *La sbessoleta*, *Le man*, *La figura*, *La vose*, *El nome*, *El serto no so che*, show the type to which in the matter of form the sonnets belong. The ancient popular theme of the *io vorria* binds together matter of a *concettoso* style. But the humorous note does not discord with a lyrical feeling quite new in Nando's work; and we here find a melody of verse that prompts congratulation:

I Penini.

Sì, benedeta ti, ti a dei penini,
Che do bisù i zà proprio, do robete,
Do pià, come se dise, balarini,
Che insieme invogia a far le piroete.
Te li vardo incantà, co ti camini,
A spesseggar come do trotolete,
Fando balar i cai dei cordonsini,
Che ben setae te tira le scarpete.
E se penso a quel omo fortunà,
Che pol vegnirghe a dar na misurada,
Senza che ti ghe dise: Via de là!
Me daria, se podesse, una peada,
Per non averme dedicà al mestier,
Belo, simpaticon, del calegher!

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Cornell University.

TWO SHAKESPEARIAN NOTES.

- (1) Give me a case to put my visage in:
[Putting on a mask]

A visor for a visor! What care I
What curious eye doth quote deformities?
Here are the beetle-brows shall blush for me.

Romeo and Juliet (1. 2. 29).

The word "beetle-brows" occurs only once in Shakespeare and has been generally interpreted

⁵ Omissions are indicated unless otherwise stated.